

COPY

February 7, 1964

STATEMENT ON CIA

I have been disturbed, as I am sure many of my colleagues have been, by the virtual epidemic of attacks on the Central Intelligence Agency in recent months.

Some of these attacks have clearly been the product of irresponsible and speculative news reporting by men who are more concerned with the headline value of something that smacks of sensation or scandal, than they are with the security of the country.

But there have also been attacks, or sharp critiques, by commentators of national reputation who are generally careful about their facts but who have apparently been impressed by some of the rumors and stories and inaccuracies which seem to have become credible because they have been repeated so often.

There have also been attacks on the CIA--and these I have found the most disturbing--by distinguished members of Congress, some of them my very good friends, who apparently have come to accept some of the demonstrably inaccurate criticisms that have been made of CIA. They may have accepted these reports as correct because some trusted friend told them that it was so. Or they may have accepted them because, having read these criticisms in several different places in the press, they have concluded that it must be so.

25 YEAR RE-REVIEW

COPY

But whatever the explanation for their statements may be, I consider them most regrettable. I am certain that they would not have made them had they taken the time to check on facts which are a matter of public record, or if they had had the opportunity, which I have had, to meet with the CIA representatives

Beating the CIA almost seems to have achieved the stature of a popular national pastime.

It is a highly dangerous pastime because the CIA is one of the essential elements of our security.

There is also something unbecoming about the pastime, because the CIA cannot defend itself. Attacking the CIA, indeed, is something like beating a man who has his arms tied behind his back. For reasons of national security, the Agency cannot confirm or deny published reports, true or false, favorable or unfavorable. It cannot alibi. It cannot explain. It cannot answer even the most outrageously inaccurate charges.

It was to this situation that President Kennedy addressed himself when he spoke to the CIA personnel at their headquarters in Langley, Virginia, on November 28, 1961.

"Your successes are unheralded," said President Kennedy. "Your failures are trumpeted. . . . But I am sure you realize how important is your work, how essential it is--and, in the long sweep of history, how significant your efforts will be judged. So I do want to express my appreciation to you now, and I am confident that in the future you will continue to

COPY

merit the appreciation of our country as you have in the past."

The charges that have been made against the CIA in recent months are almost as numerous as they are ~~various~~. We have been told that the CIA has been running wild, that it has been functioning without control or supervision either by Congress or the Administration, that it has been making foreign policy. The CIA has been blamed for the U2 incident. It has been blamed for the Bay of Pigs disaster. And it has even been blamed for the anti-Mossadegh coup in Iran and for the overthrow of the pro-communist Arbenz government in ~~Vietnam~~ ^{Guatemala}.

3a

Since the CIA cannot defend itself, I propose to say a few words about some of these charges. I feel justified in

STAT
STAT
from long conversations with them, I have some appreciation, I believe, of the work they do. If the overall quality of an agency may be judged from the quality of the men who compose it, then the CIA would have to be given a triple A rating, because I can honestly say that I have never encountered in any Government agency a body of men whose ability and dedication impressed me more. In this connection, I think it appropriate to note that, while there have been defection from other government agencies, there has never been a defection from the CIA.

Perhaps the most popular charge directed against the CIA is that it operates completely without Congressional oversight or supervision. It is this charge that has given rise to the clamor for a Congressional watchdog committee.

This charge is totally and demonstrably untrue. Indeed, the CIA is without question one of the most supervised agencies in the government. In the House and Senate, both, there are special subcommittees of the Armed Services Committee and of the Appropriations Committee that oversee the activities of CIA. In the house these subcommittees are headed by Representatives Carl Vinson and Clarence Cannon; in the Senate the subcommittees

3b

on the CIA are headed by Senator Russell and Senator Hayden. These men are among the most knowledgeable and conscientious legislators our nation has produced; and I, for one, am willing to abide by their judgment on matters which, for reasons of security, cannot be revealed to all members of Congress.

The Director of the CIA and the Chairman of the House and

COPY

Senate subcommittees have frequent meetings during the course of the year. The subcommittees are advised and fully informed of special or unusual activities, ^{They are also informed} upon the receipt of significant intelligence.

In 1963, the Director of Central Intelligence or his deputy, General Marshall S. Carter, appeared before Congressional Committees on 31 occasions, and on two other occasions the Agency was represented before Committees by other officials. In addition to briefings of the CIA subcommittees in the House and Senate, these appearances included briefings on subjects of special interest to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees, the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, and other committees.

I recall the clamor that immediately arose when our U2 plane was shot down over Soviet territory in May of 1960. Many people immediately jumped to the conclusion that the CIA had been operating on its own, without the authorization of President or Congress.

President Eisenhower put an end to the speculation about the lack of Executive authorization by informing the press that he had personally approved the U2 program. Unfortunately, it did not receive quite as much attention when Representative Cannon on May 10 rose to inform the House that the House Subcommittee was fully apprised of the project, had approved it, and had recommended the funds for it.

COPY

Let me quote his words on that occasion, because I think they constitute an adequate response to all those who, in ignorance of the facts, still charge that the CIA operates without Congressional supervision.

This is what Representative Cannon said:

"The plane was on an espionage mission authorized and supported by money provided under an appropriation recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations and passed by the Congress.

"Although the Members of the House have not generally been informed on the subject, the mission was one of a series and part of an established program with which the subcommittee in charge of the appropriation was familiar, and of which it had been fully apprised during this and previous sessions.

"The appropriation and the activity had been approved and recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and, like all military expenditures and operations, was under the aegis of the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, for whom all members of the subcommittee have the highest regard and in whose military capacity they have the utmost confidence."

It seems to me that what some members of Congress have been complaining about in advocating a Joint Congressional watchdog committee, is that they have been unaware of certain activities conducted by the CIA. But the information gathered by CIA and the activities conducted by it must, if necessary, be confined to a carefully selected and restricted committee. If this information were made available to all members of Congress, the security essential for national defense would cease to exist. Even if a joint Congressional watchdog committee were established, it would have to observe the same

COPY

...of error that today govern the activities of the House and Senate subcommittees, and those Members of Congress who would complain that they do not know what the CIA is doing, could still find that they know precious little about it. ...is this way things ought to be.

Whether or not a joint committee of Congress could more effectively supervise the activities of the CIA than the House and Senate subcommittees now in existence, is a purely mechanical question which I frankly consider to be of a third-rate importance. For my own part, I am inclined to resent the proposal because it appears to be based on the assumption that the CIA has engaged in unauthorized activities, and because it simultaneously casts doubt upon the competence and dedication of the distinguished Members of the House and Senate who now serve on the two subcommittees.

As for the oft-repeated charge that even the President doesn't know what the CIA is doing, let me quote a few paragraphs from the National Security Act of 1947, under which the Central Intelligence Agency was established.

"There is hereby established under the National Security Council a Central Intelligence Agency with a Director of Central Intelligence, who shall be the head thereof." I call particular attention to the words 'under the National Security Council.' The National Security Act further provides in section 102(d) that 'for the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, it shall be the duty of the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council--

7

"(1) to advise the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security;

"(2) to make recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security;

"(3) to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security . . .

"(4) to preform, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally;

"(5) to perform such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct."

The text of any piece of legislation makes dry reading, but I have gone to the trouble of reading these paragraphs of the National Security Act for the record because they repeatedly make it clear that the CIA functions under the direction of the National Security Council, and as an arm of the National Security Council.

They also make it abundantly clear that the CIA was to have duties broader than the simply gathering of intelligence data,

3

operating under the direction of the National Security Council.

The wording of the National Security Act was a reflexion of the growing recognition that we cannot compete with communism if we confine ourselves rigidly to orthodox diplomacy and orthodox intelligence operations. Over and over and over again, it has been demonstrated that a handful of trained communists can seize control of a trade union or a student federation, or for that matter, of a country. The fact that the overwhelming majority of the people are non-communists or anti-communists has, in most such situations, not seriously impeded them because the opposition lacks organization, lacks know-how, lacks discipline, lacks funds.

In every country that has been taken over by the communists or that has been menaced by communist takeover, there have always been men of understanding and of courage who are prepared to risk their lives for freedom. There have been situations and there will, I am certain, be situations in the future, in which some sound advice plus some limited assistance in the form of funds or even arms may make the difference between victory or defeat for the forces of freedom. If we are not prepared to give this assistance to those who share our beliefs, then we might as well run up the flag of surrender today because it can be predicted as a certainty that the communists will move unimpeded from one triumph to another.

I do not propose to draw up a score card of CIA victories and CIA defeats.



Page Denied

Next 6 Page(s) In Document Denied

16

I believe the time has come when Members of Congress and members of the press must take stock of the growing campaign against CIA and of the part they themselves may have played in forwarding this campaign.

I am not suggesting that those who criticize CIA are subversive or that the CIA should be immune to criticism because of the sensitive nature of its operations. No government agency should be immune from criticism.

I do believe, however, that there has been far too much sensationalism, far too many inaccuracies, and far too little concern for the national security in some of the criticism that has heretofore been made of the CIA.

I believe that, before we indulge in criticism of the CIA, we should take into account the fact that it cannot defend itself. We should also take into account the fact that every critical statement, whether accurate or inaccurate, will be picked up by the special bureau of the Soviet Secret Police whose task it is to discredit the CIA, and will be put to work through all the information and propaganda channels open to the Kremlin and through all its agents in the world's news media.

Because these things are so, we all share a special responsibility, if we feel constrained to criticize the CIA, to check our facts painstakingly, to weigh our words carefully, and to speak with restraint. If we have questions or complaints,

17

I believe that, before taking them to the mass circulation press, we should discuss them with the Director of the CIA or his deputy or with the chairmen of the four House and Senate committees encharged with the supervision of the CIA's activities. And if, after checking in this manner, there is any one of us who still considers it necessary to speak out against certain policies of the CIA, then I still feel that the proper place to do it would be on the floor of the Senate rather than on television or in the mass circulation periodicals.

For whatever its errors and shortcomings may be, I believe, with President Kennedy, that the CIA will in the future continue to merit the appreciation of our country, as it has in the past.

STATINTL

FEB 14 1964

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN
METRO

Weekly: circ. unknown

Front Page Edit Page Other Page 4

Date: FEB 14 1964

Asks for Joint Committee To Review CIA Activities

Rep. Clement J. Zablocki (Dem.-Wis.) told Congress recently that he has asked the House rules committee for early hearings on his bill creating a joint congressional committee on central intelligence.

Speaking on the floor of the House, Zablocki said legislation giving Congress a continuous review of U.S. intelligence activities is long overdue. He has had a bill on the subject in Congress since 1953.

The Congressman, second ranking member of the House foreign affairs committee, said the recent press conference held by the Central Intelligence Agency to comment on the Soviet economy represented "a severe departure from past CIA practices."

"Unfortunately, Congress cannot know the circumstances surrounding this apparent policy shift nor assess whether it is in the national interest," Zablocki said.

"It is my contention, however, that the intelligence activities carried on by the United States are not exclusively a function of the executive branch of our government. Congress too must be informed on intelligence matters."

The Milwaukee Congressman pointed out that currently three separate congressional committees now handle intelligence activities and appropriations.

"The result of the present system is all too often a piecemeal, hit-and-run examination of the policies and activities of the CIA and other U.S. intelligence-gathering agencies," Zablocki contended.

Press Intelligence, Inc.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

HARTFORD, CONN.
COURANT

m. 119,274

S. 161,020

Front Page Edit Page Other Page 7

Date: FEB 18 1964

Washington Report

By ROBERT D. BYRNES

Dodd Aims at CIA Critics

Sen. Dodd in the Senate Monday said he is disturbed by "unwarranted attacks" on the Central Intelligence Agency. Some of the attacks have come from congressmen and these, Dodd said, seem to him without foundation. Dodd mentioned no names of critics. A recent magazine article by Sen. Eugene McCarthy, D-Minn., called for more congressional control over CIA and Reps. Emilio Q. Daddario, D, and Abner W. Sibal, R, of Connecticut, are among many congressmen who have introduced proposals for congressional committees to be "watch-dogs" of the CIA.

Dodd said advocates of such committees are unaware of some activities of the CIA which in the interest of national security couldn't be reported to Congress anyway. The CIA, he said, is now under steady scrutiny by the Appropriations and Armed Services committees.

STATINTL

DODD BLAMES CUBA REDS FOR RIOTING, COUP

Castro Regime Poses Threat, He Warns

BY WILLIAM MOORE
(Chicago Tribune Press Service)

Washington, Feb. 10 — Sen. Thomas J. Dodd [D., Conn.] told the Senate today that the Castro regime in Cuba is a dagger pointed at this country's throat.

The warning came in a speech blaming Cuban-trained Communists for disturbances in Panama and Zanzibar.

Meanwhile Senators Mike Mansfield [D., Mont.] and Wayne Morse [D., Ore.] urged that the United States and Panama conduct prompt negotiations to settle their dispute with fairness to both countries.

More called upon the United States to begin discussions with Panama on the basis of an agreement made with the Panamanians by the late President Kennedy on June 13, 1962.

Cites 1903 Treaty

That agreement recognized Panama's dissatisfaction with the treaty of 1903, under which the Panama Canal was built.

Telling of the threat posed by the Castro regime, Dodd said:

"It is a sobering thought that in a situation such as exists in Panama, a handful of trained agitators and terrorists can provoke bloodshed resulting in hundreds of casualties and in the severance of diplomatic relations between Panama and the United States."

Dodd said press reports indicate that 45 communist agents, of whom 13 had been trained in Cuba, caused the riots in Panama.

Trained in Cuba

Dodd said that fewer than 50 subversives trained in guerilla warfare and political revolution carried out the revolution in Zanzibar. A number of these, he said, were trained in Cuba.

Dodd denounced the state department for what he said is an effort to make it appear that

the Zanzibar coup was an African nationalist movement when it was instead "a cold-blooded communist takeover."

"Panama has from the first been a prime target of Castro communism," Dodd said. "Only four months after Castro came to power in Cuba on April 26, 1959, Cuban troops wearing Cuban army uniforms landed near the village of Nombre de Dios in Panama."

"Since that time there has been a whole series of events confirming that the Cuban communist regime has designated the state of Panama as a prime target for subversion."

Predicts Next Move

Dodd recalled that after the Panama riots, he predicted that Castro's next move would be against the Guantanamo naval

base in Cuba, where Castro has cut off the water supply.

The agreement made with Panama by Kennedy came into sudden prominence yesterday when it was termed a secret agreement.

More told the Senate today, however, that the state department issued a statement about it at the time. State department officials have denied that there is any secret agreement not mentioned in the statement.

Morse said the statement contained this passage:

"The president of Panama and the President of the United States agreed upon the principle that when two friendly nations are bound by treaty provisions which are not fully satisfactory to one of the parties, arrangements should be made to permit both nations to discuss these points of dissatisfaction."

Morse Cites Statement

Morse said the statement said that the two presidents had ap-

pointed representatives to carry on discussions and that the representatives would begin their work immediately.

Morse said the statement means precisely what it says, and that this country should "not make a mockery of plain and simple language."

He said the treaty provision that the United States may hold the Canal Zone in perpetuity is not a reasonable provision in these days.

"We have been losing the cold war," Dodd said, "because we have been amateurs fighting against professional revolutionaries. What we need and need desperately is an institution that can help us prevent more Panama crises and Zanzibar takeovers."

He proposed the establishment of a freedom academy in which officials could be trained to combat communist techniques.

STATINTL

STATE DEPT., CONGRESS IN RUNNING FEUD

STATINTL

Committee Hears It Is Being Probed

(Chicago Tribune Press Service)

Washington, Jan. 15 — The Senate internal security subcommittee suspects that it is being investigated by the state department in the war between congressional committees and government agencies.

The war is over the authority of the committees to investigate the agencies. The agencies are resisting, and are even telling their officers and employees not to speak freely when called by the committees as witnesses.

The possibility that a department is investigating a subcommittee or a committee is not so far-fetched as it may seem. The agriculture department actually began in investigation of Senators Karl Mundt

(R., S. D.) and Carl Curtis (R., Neb.) during the Senate permanent investigations subcommittee's inquiry into the department's Billie Sol Estes scandal.

Dodd Tells Suspicion

Suspicion that the state department is investigating the internal security subcommittee was voiced by Sen. Thomas J. Dodd (D., Conn.) at the subcommittee's recent hearings in the Otto F. Otepka affair.

Otepka is a veteran state department security officer who has incurred the ire of some higher-ups in the department by trying to rid it of employees who are security risks.

The internal security subcommittee has called on him for information to be used in weeding out security risks, and some of Otepka's superiors began to wonder if he were volunteering information that had not even been asked.

They tapped his telephone and began searching thru his waste receptacle, known in state department gobbledygook as a "burn bag."

Read Carbon Papers

The snoopers came up with a used typewriter ribbon and some old carbon papers, from which they say they obtained evidence that Otepka had been writing questions for the subcommittee to ask of state department witnesses.

Charges were filed against Otepka and he was about to be fired when the subcommittee came to his rescue and notified the department that it would be in trouble if it fired him. The firing was postponed.

Then stories began to circulate that the department was conducting an investigation of the subcommittee's staff workers, and possibly of the senators themselves.

Sen. Dodd asked the state

department about the stories at the Otepka hearings. The department denied that it was conducting an investigation.

But Dodd is determined to find out whether the stories are true.